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**Reviewer's report:**

Overall I commend the authors for their work and for tracking their outcomes. However I have concerns regarding the conclusions and main message form this manuscript.

As stated "The second-stage TKA was delayed due to fear of having TKA at young age", I believe that it is not the standard of care to keep a provisional cemented spacer for a long time to due to concerns of survivorship of knee arthroplasty in young patients. It would have been a better practice to reimplant the patient at an appropriate time within 6 month after the cement spacer placement, and therefore avoid the bone loss.

If this would have been done, then the patient would probably have been amenable to be treated with a primary implant or a varus-valgus constrained implant at the most. I believe that bridges were burned by keeping the cement spacer, which is a transitory surgery, for 7 years which compromised the bone stock.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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